RENORMALIZATION IN QUANTUM STATISTICS OF SYSTEMS WITH SPONTANEOUS SYMMETRY BREAKING

M. Chaichian[a], J.L. Lucio M.[b], C. Montonen[c],
H. Perez Rojas[d,1], M. Vargas[b]

arXiv:hep-th/9309122v2 23 Sep 1993

a) High Energy Physics Laboratory, Department of Physics and Research Institute for High Energy Physics, P.O.Box 9, FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland
b) Instituto de Fsica de la Universidad de Guanajuato, A.P. E-143, 37150 Leon, Guanajuato, Mexico
c) Department of Theoretical Physics, P.O. Box 9, FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland
d) Centro de Investigacin y Estudios Avanzados del I.P.N., Departamento de Fsica, Apartado 14 - 740, Mexico 07000, D.F.

ABSTRACT

Renormalization in quantum statistics in the presence of a charge associated to a spontaneously broken symmetry is discussed for the scalar field model. In contrast with the case of non-broken symmetry, the renormalization mass counter term δm^2 depends on the chemical potential. We argue that this is connected to the ill-defined character of the charge operator.

[1] Permanent address: Grupo de Fisica Teorica ICIMAF, Calle E 309, esq. a 15, Vedado, La Habana 4, Cuba.

In Ref. [1] it was shown that it is not justified to introduce a charge Q^N associated to a spontaneously broken symmetry into the density matrix of a grand canonical ensemble, because such a charge cannot be considered a constant of motion. Even in the classical case Q^N need not be conserved [2]. Here we consider the renormalization of the simple scalar field model in the broken and unbroken phases. We will argue that the renormalization is the same in both cases, except for the fact that the mass renormalization is μ-dependent in the broken phase, (μ is the chemical potential connected with Q^N).

Although this result is expected from Symanziks theorem [3], we will discuss it in some detail, as in the recent literature [4] there are claims in the opposite sense. It is important to note that such a μ-dependent countertem makes the average charge $< Q^N >$ formally infinite in the broken phase, reflecting that Q^N is ill-defined in the broken phase [5].

After functional integration over canonical momenta the system is described by the partition function

$$Z = N(\beta) \int D\phi^+ D\phi^- \exp \int dx_4 \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_{eff} \tag{1a}$$

where $N(\beta)$ is an unimportant constant and $\mathcal{L}_{eff}$ is the effective Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = -(\partial_\nu - \mu\delta_{\nu 4})\phi^-(\partial_\nu + \mu\delta_{\nu 4})\phi^+ - m^2\phi^-\phi^+ - \lambda^2(\phi^-\phi^+)^2 \tag{1b}$$

where $\phi^\pm = (\phi_1 \pm i\phi_2)/\sqrt{2}$.

If there is no symmetry breaking, i.e. $m^2 > 0$ and $< \phi^\pm >= 0$, the divergences of the theory are contained in terms independent of μ and T, in other words, the renormalization constants Z_1, Z_2 and δm^2 are the same as those obtained in the Euclidean quantum field theory corresponding to the zero temperature, zero chemical potential limit.

Consider for example the tadpole term in the perturbative expansion of the temperature Green function

$$G_{il}(x,x') = G_{0il}(x,x') - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \int d^4y G_{0ij}(x_1 - y)G_{0jk}(y-y)G_{0kl}(y-x') + \cdots \tag{2}$$

In the diagonal representation of G_{0kl} we have

$$G_0(0) = \lambda^2(2\pi^2)^{-1} \sum_{k_4} \int k^2 dk G^\pm(k), \tag{3a}$$

where

$$G^\pm(k) = \begin{pmatrix} ((k_4 - i\mu)^2 + {\mathcal{E}_k}^2)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & ((k_4 + i\mu)^2 + {\mathcal{E}_k}^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and therefore

$$G_0(0) = -\lambda^2(2\pi^2)^{-1}\int k^2 dk {\mathcal{E}_k}^{-1}(n^+ + n^- - 1) \tag{3b}$$

with $\mathcal{E}_k = (k^2 + m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $n^{\pm} = (\exp(\mathcal{E}_k \mp \mu)\beta - 1)^{-1}$. Ultraviolet divergences arise only in the μ, β independent term. This means that renormalization can be achieved by introducing μ, β independent counterterms.

It should be noted that eq. (3b) (and eq. (6) below) restrict the allowed range of μ [6] even in the interacting theory as otherwise the integrands develop poles through zeros in $\varepsilon_k \pm \mu$ or $\varepsilon_{\pm}$. This makes the discussion concerning possible phase transition for $\mu^2 >> m^2$ [4, 7] irrelevant.

The same diagram calculated after the symmetry breaking, i.e. for $m^2 = -a^2$, leads to an expression analoguous to (3a) in some diagonal representation, but now

$$G^{\pm}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} (k_4^2 + \mathcal{E}_+^2)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (k_4^2 + \mathcal{E}_-^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^2 = \{(E_1^2 + E_2^2 + 4\mu^2) \pm [(E_1^2 + E_2^2 + 4\mu^2)^2 - 4E_1^2E_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}\}/2 \tag{4a}$$

and at the tree level $E_1^2 = k^2 + 2(a^2 + \mu^2), E_2^2 = k^2$.

Let us consider the terms in the diagonal of (4). After summation over k_4 they lead respectively to

$$[n(\mathcal{E}_{\pm}) + \frac{1}{2}]/\mathcal{E}_{\pm},$$

where

$$n(\mathcal{E}_{\pm}) = [\exp(\mathcal{E}_{\pm}\beta) - 1]^{-1} \tag{5}$$

Notice that in the zero temperature limit the diagonal terms lead also to divergences, however in this case they depend through $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}$ on the chemical potential. We have in the diagonal representation in which we are working

$$G_0(0)_{11,22} = -\lambda^2(2\pi^2)^{-1}\int k^2 dk \mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{-1},\ G_{0ij} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j \tag{6}$$

The leading terms in the large momentum expansion of $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{-1}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{-1} = \frac{2}{k}\left[1 - \frac{a^2 + 3\mu^2}{2k^2} \mp \frac{2\mu}{k}\left(1 + \frac{a^2 + 3\mu^2}{8\mu k^2}\right)\right] \tag{7}$$

We conclude that eq. (6) contain μ dependent divergences and in consequence, μ dependent counterterms must be added to the Lagrangian (1b).

Moreover, if we consider the zero temperature limit of the thermodynamic potential we have

$$\Omega = (4\pi^2)^{-1} \int k^2 dk (\mathcal{E}_+ + \mathcal{E}_-) \tag{8}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_+ + \mathcal{E}_- = \sqrt{2}\{k^2 + a^2 + 3\mu^2 + k[k^2 + 2(a^2 + \mu^2)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{9}$$

Expanding in powers of k^{-1} it is easily seen that Ω contains also μ dependent divergences.
A different approach to this problem was adopted by Benson, Bernstein and Dodelson in [4], where they conclude that (8) contains only μ independent divergences. Their argument is based on dimensional analysis for which they take the expectation value $\xi^2 =< \phi^2 >$ as well as μ^2, a^2, λ as *independent* parameters. But that amounts in effect to working away from the minimum of the effective potential, i.e. taking the particles off their mass shell. We will argue below that a proper calculation of the thermodynamic potential Ω requires working at the minimum of the effective potential where the vacuum expectation value ξ is given in terms of μ, a and λ. In fact, the relation between the parameters is a fundamental consequence of the spontaneous symmetry breaking and it also implies the existence of a Goldstone boson. We will show, following Fradkin and Tyutin [8], that if we consider the broken case of the μ-dependent Euclidean quantum field theory defined by the Lagrangian (1b), then: i) As in the $\mu = 0$ case, the Goldstone theorem results as a consequence of the Ward identities, ii) The exact value of ξ is given as a function of the parameters of the theory $\lambda^2, m^2 = -a^2, \mu$.

By expressing (1b) in terms of the fields ϕ_1, ϕ_2 and introducing the external currents J_1, J_2, we may write the generating functional

$$W(J_i) = -\beta^{-1} ln Z(J_i) \tag{10}$$

where

$$Z(J_i) = N(\beta) \int D\phi_1 D\phi_2 \exp \int dx_4 \int d^3x (\mathcal{L}_{eff} + J_i \phi_i) \tag{11}$$

The average fields are $\varphi_i =< \phi(J_i) >= \delta lnW/\delta J_i$ and the Green functions $G_{ij} = \delta\varphi_i/\delta J_j = \delta^2 lnW/\delta J_i(x)\delta J_j(y)$. Based on the global $U(1)$ invariance of the model we get the Ward identities

$$\int d^4x J_i(x) \varepsilon_{ij} \varphi_j(x) = 0 \tag{12}$$

where $\varepsilon_{12} = -\varepsilon_{21} = -1$; $\varepsilon_{11} = \varepsilon_{22} = 0$. From (12) by differentiating functionally with respect to the fields φ_i we get ($\varphi_1 = \xi$, $\varphi_2 = 0$ for $J_i = 0$) :

$$\begin{aligned} \xi G_{22}^{-1}(p=0,\xi) =& \xi G_{21}^{-1}(p=0,\xi) = \xi G_{12}^{-1}(p=0,\xi) = 0 \\ G_{11}^{-1}(p=0,\xi) =& \partial[\xi G_{22}^{-1}(p=0,\xi)]/\partial\xi \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The same set of equations can be obtained by starting from the renormalized Lagrangian. The set (13) then shows that i) the mass matrix has a zero eigenvalue and ii) ξ is given exactly as a function of the parameters of the theory a^2, λ^2, μ. (at the tree level $\xi^2 = (a^2+\mu^2)/\lambda^2$ arises from $G_{22}^{-1}(k^2) = k^2 + (a^2+\mu^2-\lambda^2\xi^2)$ by writing $G_{22}^{-1}(0) = 0$).

We have explicitly checked the arguments presented so far, by performing the one-loop renormalization of the model both in the broken and unbroken phases. The analysis of the unbroken phase is straightforward, the result coinciding with the $\mu = 0$ case where the renormalization constants are given by:

$$Z_\phi = 1,\ Z_m = 1 + 4\lambda\Gamma(\varepsilon),\ Z_\lambda = 1 + 10\lambda\Gamma(\varepsilon) \tag{14}$$

where $\Gamma(\varepsilon) = 1/\varepsilon + 0(\varepsilon^0)$, and to get (14) we used dimensional regularization.

In the broken phase we need to consider only the mass renormalization since the one loop μ-dependent corrections to the field ϕ and coupling constant λ are finite. In the ϕ_1', φ_2 basis the propagators are obtained from

$$(\phi_1', \phi_2) \begin{pmatrix} k_4^2 + k^2 + 2\lambda\xi^2 & -\mu k_4 \\ \mu k_4 & k_4^2 + k^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1' \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{15}$$

The one-loop corrections to the diagonal terms of the propagators resulting from (15) are readily calculated ($m_1^2 = 2\lambda\xi^2$, since we are working at the tree mass shell):

$$Z_1 = Z_2 = 1; \quad Z_{m_1} = 1 + 4\lambda\Gamma(\varepsilon) - 8\lambda(\mu^2/2\xi^2)\Gamma(\varepsilon) \tag{16}$$

while the Goldstone boson remains massless, as the Ward identities (13) demand. Notice that (16) agrees with (14) only if $\mu = 0$. We could argue that μ should be renormalized, however, explicit calculations of the corrections of the off-diagonal terms to (15) shows that they vanish.

Thus this theory requires the same type of counterterms as the theory without chemical potential, however, we see that one of these counterterms is μ-dependent. In other words, the model is renormalizable but at the price of introducing some μ-dependent counterterm. This means that renormalization prescriptions demand the introduction of some additional μ- dependent term in the exponent of the density matrix from which we started, i.e. we must write $\mathcal{H} - \mu Q^N - \delta m^2(\mu, a^2, \lambda^2)\phi^+\phi^- + \ldots$ But this implies that we are renormalizing the vacuum charge density $< Q^N >$ by subtracting from it some divergent term, the "charge" density $\partial < \delta m^2\phi^+\phi^- + \ldots > /\partial\mu$.

The μ-dependent divergence is very similar to the one arising in the Euler- Heisenberg vacuum term in electrodynamics. In that case, divergences are present in the

initial energy expression as a consequence of the vacuum fluctuations of the external field, and must be removed by subtracting divergent terms depending on the external electromagnetic field. Our case has the additional ingredient that the "external field" $< \phi^2 >= \xi^2$ depends on the chemical potential μ, and the subtraction procedure must involve a μ-dependent term.

Concerning the very interesting result obtained in Ref. [4] on the non-relativistic limit of the spectrum of the model described by (1) in the SSB case, leading to the hard-sphere boson gas spectrum, it is clear that our expression (4a) leads to the same non-relativistic limit.

The difference in the behaviour of the broken and unbroken phases can be partly understood as follows: In the symmetric case the vacuum state $|0>$ is unique, and a Hilbert space of states containing states of definite charge can be built on it. The charge operator Q is well-defined in this space, (more exactly the operator Q_V measuring the charge in a finite volume V has a well defined limit $\rho = \lim_{V\to\infty} Q_V$) and annihilates the vacuum. The statistical average is a weighted average over this space of states.

In the broken phase the situation is radically different [9,1,2]. We now have an infinity of possible vacua, and on each we can build a space of states carrying a representation of the operator algebra, not equivalent to any representation built on a different vacuum. The charge operator, which formally generates an intertwining operator between these inequivalent representations ($Q^N|\text{vac}>\neq 0$) cannot be represented in any of the state spaces, and becomes meaningless. Our results indicate that in the perturbative loop expansion considered here, this is reflected in an infinite value of the average charge $< Q^N >$. We expect that this state of affairs remains true for gauge theories as well, implying e.g. that it is meaningless to introduce a chemical potential coupled to the weak neutral charge in the standard model.

The authors thank J. Bernstein for correspondence and several illuminating remarks, A. Cabo and A. Gonzlez for fruitful discussions, and A. Zepeda for comments. The authors J.L.L.M., M.V. thank ICIMAF and C.M. thank ICIMAF and ISPJAE for hospitality in Havana, whereas H.P.R. thanks CONACyT for financial support and CINVESTAV for hospitality. J.L.L.M and M.V. were supported by CONACyT under contracts F246 - E9207 and 1628 - E9209.

References:

1) M. Chaichian, C. Montonen and H. Perez Rojas, Phys. Lett. B 256 (1991) 227.

2) M. Chaichian, J.A. Gonzlez, C. Montonen and H. Perez Rojas, Phys. Lett. B 300 (1993) 118.

3) K. Symanzik, in Cargse Lectures in Physics, vol. 5, D. Bessis ed. (Gordon and Breach, New York 1971).

4) K.M. Benson, J. Bernstein and S. Dodelson, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 2480; J. Bernstein and S. Dodelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 683.

5) L.P. Horowitz and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. D 15 (1977) 1772; see also F. Strocchi, Elements of Quantum Mechanics of Infinite Systems (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).

6) H.E. Haber and H.A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 46 (1981) 1947; Phys. Rev. D25 (1982) 502.

7) S. Mohan, Phys. Lett. B 307 (1993) 367.

8) E.S. Fradkin, I.V. Tyutin, Riv. del Nuovo Cim. 4 (1974) 1.

9) R. Haag, Nuovo Cimento 19 (1962) 287.